FILED

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

AUG 17 2017

United States of America,	SUSAN Y. SOONG CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
Plaintiff, v.) STIPULATED ORDER EXCLUDING TIME) UNDER THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT
Joseph Rivers) CR 17-394 VC) 17-393 WHA
Defendant.) 17-393 WHA
For the reasons stated by the parties on the record or Speedy Trial Act from \(\frac{\gamma/17/17}{17} \), to \(\frac{1}{2} \) by the continuance outweigh the best interest of the 3161(h)(7)(A). The Court makes this finding and be	the Court excludes time under the q/5/17 and size and finds that the ends of justice served public and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. § asses this continuance on the following factor(s):
Failure to grant a continuance would See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i).	be likely to result in a miscarriage of justice.
defendants, the nature of the p or law, that it is unreasonable to expe	the number of prosecution, or the existence of novel questions of fact adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial and by this section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii).
	deny the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, are diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).
	unreasonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given nitments, taking into account the exercise of due diligence.
	unreasonably deny the defendant the reasonable time king into account the exercise of due diligence.
IT IS SO ORDERED. DATED: 8/17	Sly MD Copalo
	United States Magistrate Judge
STIPULATED: Carlo marketen Attorney for Defendant	Assistant United States Attorney